Scope to move an Amendment after closure motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—During the debate on the non-official resolution yesterday, tabled by Sri J. Naranappa, I understand that when one of the members from the Panel of Chairmen was in the Chair, Hon'ble Sri B. Shamsunder moved a motion for closure of the debate. It would further appear that when this motion was made, Hon'ble Member Sri H. M. Channabasappa had already been permitted by the Chair to speak on the resolution and he had just begun to make his speech. It was at this stage that Sri B. Shamsunder sought to move the closure motion. The Chairman put the closure motion to the vote of the House and it was adopted. But, at the suggestion from the Minister for Revenue that Hon'ble member Sri H. M. Channabasappa be permitted to complete his speech because he had commenced to speak when the closure motion was passed, the Chairman permitted Sri H. M. Channabasappa to speak. After the Hon'ble Member Sri H. M. Channabasappa concluded and when the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue got up to reply to the debate, Hon'ble Member Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy got up and stated that he wanted permission to move an amendment to the resolution. It was at this stage that there appears to have been some confusion as to what actually happened on the floor of the House. It is seen from the records that the Chairman stated that he had permitted Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy to move the amendment and a number of Hon'ble Members rose to request the Chair to clarify the position as the moving of an amendment at this stage appeared to them to be not in order.

It is not necessary for me to go into great detail because of the view that I take on the whole question. In the first place a closure motion is usually put to the House only at the end of a speech and before another member gets up to speak If any Hon'ble Member gets up to make his speech then a closure motion cannot be moved or accepted by the Chair. A closure motion will be in order only when it is moved between two speeches. In any case once a closure motion was put to the House and voted for, it was not in order for any amendment to be proposed to the House. I understand from the Chairman that there were two matters that he had to consider, namely, a proposal under rule 169 to suspend the operation of rule 107 in relation to motion before the House and secondly the amendment itself and that what he intended to say was that he was prepared to give his consent to the Hon'ble Member Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy to make a motion under rule 169. Unfortunately the wording used by the Chairman was that he permitted Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy to move the amendment when he actually meant that he was giving permission to make a motion under rule 169. But before any clarification could be made by the Chair a number of points of order were raised and it was impossible at this stage to indicate what the Chairman had in mind. It is not however useful to pursue this point because as I have stated I am of the view that the stage for making an amendment had passed and Hon'ble Member Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy was not in order in trying to move an amendment to the resolution. I therefore do not propose to call upon the Hon'ble Member Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy to move his amendment or even to make a motion under rule 169. I propose to call upon the mover of the resolution to reply to the debate after which Hon'ble Minister in charge will reply and unless the mover wants to withdraw his motion, it will be put to vote.

During the discussion that took place yesterday I notice that some questions were raised about the finality of rulings from the Chair. I must say that for the orderly conduct of proceedings it is essential that a ruling from the Chair should be final. I have often stated that it may be that there are two points of view and some Hon'ble Members may feel that that the ruling could have been different. But if a ruling from the Chair should be questioned on the spot and a debate should ensue as to whether a ruling is

(MR. SPEAKER)

correct or not, the proceedings of the Assembly will merely end in chaos. It is for this reason that it has been laid down in our rules which, in this respect follows the rules of the Lok Sabha and various other State Legislatures, that a ruling of the Chair shall be final and shall not be questioned in the House. If any Hon'ble Member honestly feels that the ruling was incorrect or that the speaker could have given a different ruling, instead of raising it on the floor of the House, it is always open to him to discuss with the Speaker, so that if the Speaker is convinced that his ruling could have been otherwise, he will take the next opportunity of giving a ruling more in accordance with what is proper and right. In this way order will be maintained in the House and Hon'ble Members will have the satisfaction that they have discussed the matter with the Speaker and he will stand corrected or will have pursuaded the Speaker to accept a different point of view which will prevail when another occasion arises for a similar ruling. Unless the Speaker's ruling is accepted without question and all further discussion stops, it will be impossible to conduct the proceedidngs in an orderly fashion and I am sure all Hon'ble Members will agree with me on this point.

There is one other point to which I like to refer at this stage, that is, in regard to raising of points of order. In the first place where a point of order is raised it has to be disposed of before another point of order could be raised. I have noticed a tendency of Hon'ble Members rising and claiming that they have a point of order when actually there will be no point of order but it will be merely a speech on what is before the House. Where an Hon'ble Member claims to raise a point of order the Chair has no option but to permit him. It is therefore all the more necessary that Hon'ble Members should exercise this right only on proper and legitimate occasions.

We will now proceed with the resolution before the House and the mover will reply to the debate.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS

No. 1. Payment of Monthly Salaries to Thoties and Talaries instead of Mirase.

(Discussion continued)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ನಾರಾಯಣಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರಿ ಜೆ. ನಾರಾಯಣಪ್ಪ (ಮುಳಬಾಗಿಲು).—ಈ ಬಡಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಭಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಕೈಲಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನಂತರ ನಾನು ಮುಂದಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸುವೆನು.

*Sri M. P. PATIL (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I fully sympathise with the motive with which this resolution has been moved. The Government is aware of the plight of this class of people. As this question had been raised from time to time, the Old Mysore Government had appointed a committee in 1943 to examine this question. The committee considered this question fully and came to the conclusion th t even though the situation was not good in connection with these servants, they thought that the system which was prevailing at that time was the only system which could be adopted. You might be knowing, Sir, that this system is prevailing since hundreds of years. Originally, these people were given lands for the services which they rendered both to the Government and to the people. For instance, the Thoties and Talwars were expected to protect the crops of the ryots and at the same time to protect the property of the villagers also. They are also expected to help the village officers in the collection of revenue and in other matters. As time passed, situation changed and their duties to ryots were also changed. For instance, in the old days it was very necessary to protect the crops of the ryots from the robbers, but as the law and order situation improved, there was no necessity of having any protection for the crops of the ryots. They were remunerated for the services they were rendering both to the Government and to the ryots in the form of land and also in the form of mirase which is a small share in the production of the ryot in his field.